UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,230	01/10/2006	Helmut Jerg	2003P00937WOUS	7445

46726 7590 11/23/2009

BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD
NEW BERN, NC 28562

EXAMINER	
OSTERHOUT, BENJAMIN LEE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NBN-IntelProp@bshg.com

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments

Regarding the drawings, since Applicant has included new drawings that show the claimed features, the objection to the drawings is cured.

Regarding Applicant's response to claim 10 and 19-20, Examiner has carefully review Applicant's argument; however, Examiner is not persuaded by said arguments. Applicant does not clearly argue in support of patentability of claim 10, but rather claims 19 and 20 (See Applicants arguments, page 6, ll. 8-14) in that Applicant has created a new argument debating the source of the air wherein said air is passed through the sorption column. Examiner's primary source of concern with this argument is that Applicant is claiming a dishwasher, not a source of air or the air itself which is passed through the sorption column. Applicant should specifically claim the structure that allows communication from the dishwasher to the sorption column. Furthermore, Fried et al. clearly shows a communication path between the sorption device and the washing container (Fig. 1, parts 3 and 12). Also, Applicant should note that the drying system of Fried et al. appears to be a closed system, therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the "air" must be ambient or from the washing container. Lastly, Examiner is still treating said language with regards to the "air" in claims 19-20 as intended use, does not provide further structural limitations to the claim language, and will not be given patentable weight. Furthermore, it is noted that the apparatus of Fried et al. is capable of performing said intended use.

Regarding Applicant's response to claim 16, Dinh clearly teaches a cooler/condenser. Applicant's argument does not fully address said rejection, only noting that Dihn does not address the deficiencies of Fried et al. with regards to claim 10. However, Examiner has addressed said arguments therefore Examiner is not convinced and thus sustains all prior rejections.

Regarding Applicant's response to claim 22, Applicant argues that the pipe discussed in Fried et al. is not a pipe along which air is passed from the wash container but is instead, a pipe along which air is passed into the washing container. Examiner aggress that the pipe is a pipe along which air is passed into the washing container. However, Applicant is mistaken in believing that Applicant has claimed that the air passes through the outlet and pipe with check valve. Applicant has merely claimed that the washing container has an outlet and pipe with check valve.

Therefore Examiner has addressed all of Applicant's concerns/arguments after much consideration. However, Examiner is not convinced by any of Applicant's arguments, therefore the rejections are upheld.

/Joseph L. Perrin/
Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/BLO/

Benjamin L. Osterhout

17 November 2009